



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/748,117

12/29/2003

Derek O'Hagan

PP020038.0003

1746

27476

7590

11/13/2009

NOVARTIS VACCINES AND DIAGNOSTICS INC.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY- X100B

P.O. BOX 8097

Emeryville, CA 94662-8097

EXAMINER

MINNIFIELD, NITA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1645

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/13/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/748,117	Applicant(s) O'HAGAN, DEREK	
	Examiner N. M. Minnifield	Art Unit 1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2, 17 and 29-85 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-16, 18, 19, 22-28 and 86-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 17 and 29-85 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.1 14, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.1 14, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.1 7(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.1 14. Applicant's submission filed on August 26, 2009 has been entered.
2. Applicants' amendment filed August 26, 2009 is acknowledged and has been entered. New claims 86-88 have been added. Claims 1-88 are now pending in the present application. All rejections have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the claims and/or comments, with the exception of those discussed below.
3. Claims 2, 17 and 29-85 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention and/or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on April 16, 2007.
4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 1 12:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
5. Claims 1, 3-16, 18-28 and 86-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an immunogenic composition comprising those components in the immunogenic compositions set forth in Tables 2,3A-3C, does not reasonably provide enablement for an immunogenic composition comprising any combination of possible components as set forth in the claims. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with

Art Unit: 1645

which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The claims are directed to immunogenic compositions comprising water, a polymer microparticle, an antigen adsorbed to the microparticle and a synthetic phospholipid. The claims and specification also define various synthetic phospholipids as well as polymers. The antigen can be adsorbed or entrapped on or within the microparticles. The claims defined a broad spectrum of antigens. The specification teaches numerous adjuvants for use in the immunogenic compositions.

The specification is only enabled for those immunogenic compositions set forth in the instant specification shown in Tables 2 and 3A-3C, for example PLG/MenB +sol Eisai 53 or MF59/Eisai 57 + sol gp120. The specification does not enable the full scope of the genus of the claimed immunogenic compositions.

For a claimed genus, representative examples together with a statement applicable to the genus as a whole will ordinarily be sufficient if one skilled in the art (in view of level of skill, state of the art and the information in the specification) would expect the claimed genus could be used in that manner without undue experimentation. Proof of enablement will be required for other members of the claimed genus only where adequate reasons are advanced by the examiner to establish that a person skilled in the art could not use the genus as a whole without undue experimentation. MPEP 2164.02

The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the amount of knowledge in the state of the art as well as the predictability in the art. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833,839, 166 USPQ 18,24 (CCPA 1970). The "amount of guidance or direction" refers to that information in the application, as originally filed, that teaches exactly how to make or use the invention. The more that is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention, how to make, and how to use the invention, and the more predictable the art is, the less information needs to be explicitly stated in the specification. In contrast, if little is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention and the art is unpredictable, the specification would need more detail as to how to make and use the invention in order to be enabling. >See, e.g., Chiron Corp. v. Genentech Inc., 363 F.3d 1247,1254,70 USPQ2d 1321, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2004)

Art Unit: 1645

("Nascent technology, however, must be enabled with a specific and useful teaching.' The law requires an enabling disclosure for nascent technology because a person of ordinary skill in the art has little or no knowledge independent from the patentee's instruction. Thus, the public's end of the bargain struck by the patent system is a full enabling disclosure of the claimed technology." (citations omitted)). MPEP 2164.03

With regard to the state of the art for the claimed invention, it is noted that there is unpredictability with regard to making and using adjuvants as asserted by Applicants and the art. Edleman (Molecular Biotechnology, 2002, 21/2:129-148) teaches that the state of the art for combining adjuvants is unpredictable. "Every adjuvant has a complex and often multi-factorial immunological mechanism, usually poorly understood in vivo. Many determinants of adjuvanicity exist, and each adjuvanted vaccine is unique. Adjuvant safety is critical and can enhance, retard, or stop development of an adjuvanted vaccine. The choice of an adjuvant often depends upon expensive experimental trial and error, upon cost and upon commercial availability." (abstract) Examples of adjuvant formulations tested in humans with a variety of antigens (and with variable success) include various combinations (see p. 130, section 2.2). Edleman also teaches that "One must remember that in vivo, most adjuvants have complex and multifactorial immunological mechanisms, often poorly understood. The immunological mechanisms utilized by many adjuvants are under investigation. Such investigations will provide answers to some of the following questions. Does the adjuvant induce cell mediated (Th1) immunity, humoral (Th2) immunity, or a balance of Th1 and Th2? Which IG isotypes dominate? Which cytokines are induced? Are CD4+ T-helper cells or CD8+ cytotoxic T-lymphocytes induced? The list of such questions is extensive, and grows in proportion to our understanding of immunological mechanisms in general." (p. 134, section 4.1) "The ability of adjuvants to influence so many parameters of the immune response greatly complicates the process of finding an effective adjuvant. This is because our knowledge of how any one adjuvant operates on a cellular level is insufficient to support a completely rational approach for matching the vaccine antigen with the proper adjuvant." (p. 135, section 5) Spickler et al (J. Vet. Intern. Med., 2003, 17:273-281) teaches that "The results of combining adjuvants depends on the mechanism of action and toxicity of

Art Unit: 1645

each individual component. Combinations may be better, similar to, or worse than the individual components." (p. 278) As pointed by Applicants, "adjuvant science is anything but predictable. Indeed, when it comes to adjuvants, there are a near-infinite number of possible combinations that are available to the ordinarily skilled artisan, none of which is predictable." (see p.22 of Remarks filed May 20,2009)

The "predictability or lack thereof" in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed invention. If one skilled in the art can readily anticipate the effect of a change within the subject matter to which the claimed invention pertains, then there is predictability in the art. On the other hand, if one skilled in the art cannot readily anticipate the effect of a change within the subject matter to which that claimed invention pertains, then there is lack of predictability in the art. Accordingly, what is known in the art provides evidence as to the question of predictability. In particular, the court in *In re Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220,223-24, 169 USPQ 367,369-70 (CCPA 1971), stated: [I]n the field of chemistry generally, there may be times when the well-known unpredictability of chemical reactions will alone be enough to create a reasonable doubt as to the accuracy of a particular broad statement put forward as enabling support for a claim. This will especially be the case where the statement is, on its face, contrary to generally accepted scientific principles. Most often, additional factors, such as the teachings in pertinent references, will be available to substantiate any doubts that the asserted scope of objective enablement is in fact commensurate with the scope of protection sought and to support any demands based thereon for proof. [Footnote omitted.]

The scope of the required enablement varies inversely with the degree of predictability involved, but even in unpredictable arts, a disclosure of every operable species is not required. A single embodiment may provide broad enablement in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements. *In re Vickers*, 141 F.2d 522,526-27, 61USPQ 1 22, 127 (CCPA 1944); *In re Cook*, 439 F.2d 730,734,169 USPQ 298, 301 (CCPA 1971). However, in applications directed to inventions in arts where the results are unpredictable, the disclosure of a single species usually does not provide an adequate basis to support generic claims. *In re Soll*, 97 F.2d 623, 624, 38

Art Unit: 1645

USPQ 189, 191 (CCPA 1938). In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, more may be required. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) (contrasting mechanical and electrical elements with chemical reactions and physiological activity). See also In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 15 10,15 13 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 496, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1991). This is because it is not obvious from the disclosure of one species, what other species will work. MPEP 2164.03

While the analysis and conclusion of a lack of enablement are based on the factors discussed in MPEP § 2 164.01 (a) and the evidence as a whole, it is not necessary to discuss each factor in the written enablement rejection. The language should focus on those factors, reasons, and evidence that lead the examiner to conclude that the specification fails to teach how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation, or that the scope of any enablement provided to one skilled in the art is not commensurate with the scope of protection sought by the claims. This can be done by making specific findings of fact, supported by the evidence, and then drawing conclusions based on these findings of fact. For example, doubt may arise about enablement because information is missing about one or more essential parts or relationships between parts which one skilled in the art could not develop without undue experimentation. In such a case, the examiner should specifically identify what information is missing and why one skilled in the art could not supply the information without undue experimentation. See MPEP § 2164.06(a). References should be supplied if possible to support a prima facie case of lack of enablement, but are not always required. In re Marzocchi, 439 F.2d 220,224,169 USPQ 367,370 (CCPA 1971). However, specific technical reasons are always required. MPEP 2164.03

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are set forth in In re Wands 8 USPQ2d 1400. They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art and (8) the breadth of the claims.

Applying the above test to the facts of record, it is determined that 1) no declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 or other relevant evidence has been made of record establishing the amount of experimentation necessary, 2) specification with respect to the genus of the claimed immunogenic compositions, 3) the relative skill of those in the art is commonly recognized as quite high (post-doctoral level). With regard to (4) the nature of the invention and 5) the state of the prior art, these have been discussed above. One of skill in the art would require guidance and undue experimentation, in order to make and use the numerous species of adjuvant combinations claimed and set forth in the instant specification in view of the unpredictability as shown in the state of the art. The claims are enabled for those immunogenic compositions as set forth in Tables 2 and 3A-3C as set forth in the specification.

6. No claims are allowed.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to N. M. Minnifield whose telephone number is 571-272-0860. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert B. Mondesi can be reached on 571-272-0956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Art Unit: 1645

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call
800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. M. Minnifield/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645

November 6, 2009